Evolving extrinsic curvature and the cosmological constant problem

A.J.S. Capistrano*
1 Federal University of Latin-American Integration, 85867-970, P.o.b: 2123, Foz do Iguaçu-PR, Brazil and 2 Casimiro Montenegro Filho Astronomy Center, Itaipu Technological Park, 85867-900, Foz do Iguassu-PR, Brazil

L.A. Cabral†
3 Federal University of Tocantins, 77804-970, Araguaína-TO, Brazil
(Dated: December 10, 2015)

The concept of smooth deformation of Riemannian manifolds associated with the extrinsic curvature is explained and applied to the FLRW cosmology. We show that such deformation can be derived from Einstein-Hilbert-like dynamical principle producing an observable effect in the sense of Noether. As a result, we notice on how the extrinsic curvature compensates both quantitative and qualitative difference between the cosmological constant Λ and the vacuum energy ρ_{vac} obtaining the observed upper bound for the cosmological constant problem at electroweak scale. The topological characteristics of the extrinsic curvature are discussed showing that the produced extrinsic scalar curvature is an evolving dynamical quantity.

arXiv:1410.1413v2 [gr-qc] 9 Dec 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

In a previous investigation [1] we studied a modification imposed on Friedman's equation when the standard model of the universe is regarded as an embedded space-time [2]. It was shown that a more fundamental explanation for the dynamics of the extrinsic curvature is required and given by the Gupta equations [3]. As a result, the accelerated expansion of the universe could be explained as an effect of the extrinsic curvature.

In this work, we study the cosmological constant (CC) problem that primarily consists in a seemingly unexplainable difference between the small value of the CC estimated by cosmological observations to be $\Lambda/8\pi G \sim 10^{-47}\ GeV^4$ and the theoretical value is given by the vacuum energy density that results from gravitationally coupled quantum fields in space-time estimated to be of the order of $<\rho_v> \sim 10^{71}\ GeV^4$. Such large difference cannot be eliminated by renormalization techniques in quantum field theory as it would require an extreme fine tuning [4, 5]. In the last decade, it became a central issue in the context of the ΛCDM cosmological model regarded as the simplest model for the accelerated expansion of the universe. In addition, another dilemma requires attention that is a proper explanation to the apparently coincidence between the current matter density energy and CC (as interpreted as the vacuum energy) commonly known as the *coincidence problem* [6, 7]. A varieties of solutions for the CC problems have been proposed in literature such as in general relativity [8–10], strings [11] and branes [12–14], conformal symmetry of gravity [15] and other works [16–20].

In a different direction, we address the CC problem from a geometrical approach. We use essentially that in embedded space-time the gauge fields remain confined to the embedded space but the gravitational field propagates along the extra dimensions (similar to the brane-world program originally proposed in [21]). On the other hand, it is important to point out that the difference between the vacuum energy and the CC is hidden in most brane-world models because the extrinsic curvature is commonly replaced by a function of the confined source fields. As commonly thought, the only accepted relation of the extrinsic curvature with matter sources is the Israel-Lanczos boundary condition, as applied to the Randall-Sundrum brane-world cosmology [22, 23]. However, this condition fixes once for all the extrinsic curvature and does not follow the dynamics of the brane-world. Other approaches have been developed with no need of particular junction conditions [24, 25] and/or with different junction conditions which lead to several approaches of brane-world models widely studied in literature [26–31].

The main purpose of this paper is to show that the CC problem comes from a fundamental origin, not only because it involves the structure of the Einstein-Hilbert principle but also because it reinforces a clearly distinction between of gravitation from gauge fields. In what follows, we focus on the CC problem at low redshift, since it is verified in the present epoch [18, 19]. We obtain an explicit relation involving the extrinsic curvature and the absolute difference between CC and the vacuum energy density. As we shall see, we show that the dynamics of the extrinsic curvature has a more profound meaning which a four-dimensional observer can detect a difference between Einstein's CC and the confined vacuum energy through a conserved quantity. Another relevant aspect is how the extrinsic scalar Q evolves and its topological consequences. In this framework we are neglecting fluctuations and/or effects of structure formation. Finally, remarks are presented in the conclusion section.

* abraao.capistrano@unila.edu.br
† cabral@uft.edu.br

II. THE FLRW EMBEDDED UNIVERSE

II.1. Modified friedmann equations

We start with the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) line element in coordinates (r, θ, ϕ, t) given by

$$ds^2 = -dt^2 + a^2 \left[dr^2 + f_\kappa^2(r) \left(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\varphi^2 \right) \right] , \quad (1)$$

where $f_\kappa(r) = \sin r,\ r$,$\sinh r$ correspond to $\kappa = (1,\ 0,\ -1)$, and the term $a = a(t)$ is the expansion parameter. This model can be regarded as a four-dimensional hypersurface dynamically evolving in a five-dimensional "bulk" with constant curvature. This geometry induced by four-dimensional FLRW line element is completely embedded in a five-dimensional bulk. The Riemann tensor is given by [**?**]

$$\mathcal{R}_{ABCD} = K_* \left(\mathcal{G}_{AC}\mathcal{G}_{DB} - \mathcal{G}_{AD}\mathcal{G}_{CB} \right) ,$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{AB}$ denotes the bulk metric components in arbitrary coordinates. The constant curvature K_* has three possible values : it is either zero (flat bulk), a positive (de Sitter) or negative (anti-de Sitter) constant curvatures.

Since we are dealing with embedding of geometries, the general solution was given by John Nash in 1956 [32], using only differentiable (non-analytic) properties. In short, starting with an embedded Riemannian manifold with metric $g_{\mu\nu}$ and extrinsic curvature $k_{\mu\nu}$, Nash showed that any other embedded Riemannian geometry can be generated by differentiable perturbations, with metric $\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} + \delta g_{\mu\nu}$, where

$$\delta g_{\mu\nu} = -2k_{\mu\nu a}\delta y^a , \quad (2)$$

and where δy^a is an infinitesimal displacement in one of the extra dimension. From this new metric, we obtain a new extrinsic curvature $k_{\mu\nu}$ and the procedure can be repeated indefinitely

$$g_{\mu\nu} = g_{\mu\nu} + \delta y^a\, k_{\mu\nu a} + \delta y^a \delta y^b\, g^{\rho\sigma} k_{\mu\rho a} k_{\nu\sigma b} \cdots \quad (3)$$

For this reason, depending on the size of the bulk, the embedding map can be well defined and, at first, one does not need to perturb the line element in eq.(1) in the y-coordinate direction, since Nash theorem already guarantees this property.

Taking the perfect fluid of the standard cosmology as composed of ordinary matter interacting with gauge fields, it must remain confined to the four-dimensional space-time on all stages of the evolution of the universe. Since all cosmological observations point to an accelerated expanding universe towards a de Sitter configuration [33, 34], we choose $K_* > 0$, although our results also hold for any other choice of K_*. The bulk geometry is actually defined by the Einstein-Hilbert principle that leads to the Einstein equations

$$\mathcal{R}_{AB} - \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{R}\mathcal{G}_{AB} = \alpha_* T^*_{AB} . \quad (4)$$

The confinement condition implies that $K_* = \Lambda/6$ and T^*_{AB} denotes the energy-momentum tensor of the known sources.

The confinement of gauge fields and ordinary matter are a standard assumption specially in what concerns the brane-world program as a part of the solution of the hierarchy problem of the fundamental interactions: the four-dimensionality of space-time is a consequence of the invariance of Maxwell's equations under the Poincaré group. Such condition was latter extended to all gauge fields expressed in terms of differential forms and their duals. However, in spite of many attempts, gravitation, in the sense of Einstein, does not fit in such scheme. Thus, while all known gauge fields are confined to the four-dimensional submanifold, gravitation as defined in the whole bulk space by the Einstein-Hilbert principle, propagates in the bulk. The proposed solution of the hierarchy problem says that gravitational energy scale is somewhere within TeV scale.

The most general expression of this confinement is that the confined components of T_{AB} are proportional to the energy-momentum tensor of general relativity: $\alpha_* T_{\mu\nu} = -8\pi G T_{\mu\nu}$. On the other hand, since only gravity propagates in the bulk we have $T_{\mu a} = 0$ and $T_{ab} = 0$.

Since we are dealing with the relations between embedded space-times, we can restrict our analysis to the local embedding of five-dimensions which can be summarized defining an embedding map $\mathcal{Z} : \bar{V}_4 \to V_5$ admitting that $\mathcal{Z}^\mu$ is a regular and differentiable map with V_4 and V_5 being the embedded space-time and the bulk, respectively. The components $\mathcal{Z}^A = f^A(x^1, ..., x^4)$ associate with each point of V_4 to a point in V_5 with coordinates $\mathcal{Z}^A$ that are the components of the tangent vectors of V_4. Moreover, taking the tangent, vector and scalar components of eq.(4) defined in the Gaussian frame vielbein $\{\mathcal{Z}^A_{,\mu}, \eta^A\}$, where η^A are the components of the normal vectors of V_4, one can write the set of equations in the five-dimensional de Sitter bulk [1, 2]

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}R g_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} - Q_{\mu\nu} = -8\pi G T_{\mu\nu} , \quad (5)$$

$$k_{\mu;\ \rho}^{\ \rho} - h_{,\mu} = 0 , \quad (6)$$

where $T_{\mu\nu}$ is the 4-dimensional energy-momentum tensor of the perfect fluid expressed in co-moving coordinates as

$$T_{\mu\nu} = (p + \rho)U_\mu U_\nu + p\, g_{\mu\nu}, \quad U_\mu = \delta^4_\mu .$$

It is important to point out that the quantity $Q_{\mu\nu}$ is a completely geometrical term given by

$$Q_{\mu\nu} = g^{\rho\sigma} k_{\mu\rho} k_{\nu\sigma} - k_{\mu\nu} h - \frac{1}{2}\left(K^2 - h^2 \right) g_{\mu\nu} , \quad (7)$$

where $h = g^{\mu\nu} k_{\mu\nu}$, $h^2 = h.h$ and $K^2 = k^{\mu\nu} k_{\mu\nu}$. It follows

that $Q_{\mu\nu}$ is conserved in the sense that

$$Q^{\mu\nu}{}_{;\nu} = 0 \, . \tag{8}$$

The general solution for eq.(6) using the FLRW metric is

$$k_{ij} = \frac{b}{a^2} g_{ij}, \;\; k_{44} = \frac{-1}{\dot{a}} \frac{d}{dt} \frac{b}{a}$$

in this case $i, j = 1, 2, 3$, where we also notice that the "warping" function $b(t) = k_{11}$ remains an arbitrary function of time. This follows from the confinement of the gauge fields that produces the homogeneous equation in eq.(6).

The usual Hubble parameter in terms of the expansion scaling factor $a(t) = a$ is denoted by $H = \dot{a}/a$ and the extrinsic parameter $B = \dot{b}/b$. Solving the set of eq.(5) and eq.(6), one can obtain

$$k_{44} = -\frac{b}{a^2} \left(\frac{B}{H} - 1 \right) g_{44}, \; h = \frac{b}{a^2} \left(\frac{B}{H} + 2 \right), \tag{9}$$

$$K^2 = \frac{b^2}{a^4} \left(\frac{B^2}{H^2} - 2\frac{B}{H} + 4 \right), \tag{10}$$

$$Q_{ij} = \frac{b^2}{a^4} \left(2\frac{B}{H} - 1 \right) g_{ij}, \; Q_{44} = -\frac{3b^2}{a^4}, \tag{11}$$

$$Q = -(K^2 - h^2) = \frac{6b^2}{a^4} \frac{B}{H} \, . \tag{12}$$

In the case of eq.(11), consider $i, j = 1, 2, 3$.

Replacing these results in eq.(5), we obtain the Friedman equation modified by the extrinsic curvature as

$$\left(\frac{\dot{a}}{a} \right)^2 + \frac{\kappa}{a^2} = \frac{4}{3} \pi G \rho + \frac{\Lambda}{3} + \frac{b^2}{a^4} \;\; . \tag{13}$$

II.2. Gupta extrinsic equation and the unique solution for the "warping" function b(t)

The arbitrariness of "warping" function $b(t)$ is a consequence of the homogeneity of eq.(6) which follows from the confinement condition $T^*_{\mu a} = 0$. If these components were non zero, we would violate the intended solution of the hierarchy problem. For instance, the Randall-Sundrum brane-world models avoid such difficulty by fixing the brane-world as a boundary at $y = 0$ and applying the Israel-Lanczos boundary condition. In order to obtain dynamical equations, the Gupta equations were used and the function $b(t)$ was determined by constructing the dynamics of extrinsic curvature $k_{\mu\nu}$ interpreted as a component of gravitational field besides the metric $g_{\mu\nu}$.

In short, the study of linear massless spin-2 fields in Minkowski space-time by Fierz and Pauli dates back to late 1930's [35]. In 1954, Gupta [3] noted that the Fierz-Pauli equation has a remarkable resemblance with the linear approximation of Einstein's equations for the gravitational field, suggesting that such equation could be just the linear approximation of a more general, non-linear equation for massless spin-2 fields. In reality, he found that any spin-2 field in Minkowski space-time must satisfy an equation that has the same formal structure as Einstein's equations. This amounts to saying that, in the same way as Einstein's equations can be obtained by an infinite sequence of infinitesimal perturbations of the linear gravitational equation, it is possible to obtain a non-linear equation for any spin-2 field by applying an infinite sequence of infinitesimal perturbations to the Fierz-Pauli equations. The result obtained by S. Gupta is an Einstein-like system of equations [3, 36].

In the following we use an analogy with the derivation of the Riemann tensor to write Gupta's equation in a Riemannian manifold with metric geometry $g_{\mu\nu}$ embedded in a five-dimensional bulk. In this analogy we construct a "connection" associated with $k_{\mu\nu}$ and then, find its corresponding Riemann tensor, but keeping in mind that the geometry of the embedded space-time has been previously defined by $g_{\mu\nu}$. To do so, we define the tensors

$$f_{\mu\nu} = \frac{2}{K} k_{\mu\nu}, \;\; \text{and} \;\; f^{\mu\nu} = \frac{2}{K} k^{\mu\nu} \, , \tag{14}$$

so that $f^{\mu\rho} f_{\rho\nu} = \delta^\mu_\nu$. In the sequence we construct the "Levi-Civita connection" associated with $f_{\mu\nu}$, based on the analogy with the "metricity condition" $f_{\mu\nu||\rho} = 0$, where $||$ denotes the covariant derivative with respect to $f_{\mu\nu}$ (while keeping the usual $(;)$ notation for the covariant derivative with respect to $g_{\mu\nu}$). With this condition we obtain the "f-connection"

$$\Upsilon_{\mu\nu\sigma} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\partial_\mu \, f_{\sigma\nu} + \partial_\nu \, f_{\sigma\mu} - \partial_\sigma \, f_{\mu\nu} \right)$$

and

$$\Upsilon_{\mu\nu}{}^{\lambda} = f^{\lambda\sigma} \, \Upsilon_{\mu\nu\sigma}$$

and the "f-Riemann tensor"

$$\mathcal{F}_{\nu\mu\alpha\lambda} = \partial_\alpha \Upsilon_{\mu\lambda\nu} - \partial_\lambda \Upsilon_{\mu\alpha\nu} + \Upsilon_{\alpha\sigma\mu} \Upsilon^\sigma_{\lambda\nu} - \Upsilon_{\lambda\sigma\mu} \Upsilon^\sigma_{\alpha\nu}$$

and the "f-Ricci tensor" and the "f-Ricci scalar", defined with $f_{\mu\nu}$ are, respectively,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu} = f^{\alpha\lambda} \mathcal{F}_{\nu\alpha\lambda\mu} \;\; \text{and} \;\; \mathcal{F} = f^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu}$$

Finally, write the Gupta equations for the $f_{\mu\nu}$ field

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{F} f_{\mu\nu} = \alpha_f \tau_{\mu\nu} \tag{15}$$

where $\tau_{\mu\nu}$ stands for the source of the f-field, with coupling constant α_f. However, unlike the case of Einstein's equations, here we do not have the equivalent to the Newtonian weak field limit, then we cannot tell about the nature of the source term $\tau_{\mu\nu}$ based on experience. As a first guess we may start with the simplest "f-Ricci-flat"

equation

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mu\nu} = 0 \ . \tag{16}$$

As we use eq.(1) and calculate eq.(16), we can take eq.(7) and eq.(8) and obtain the expression for the "warping" function $b(t)$ that is given by

$$b(t) = \alpha_0 a^{\beta_0} e^{\pm\frac{1}{2}\gamma(t)} \ . \tag{17}$$

We denote $\alpha_0 = b_0/a_0^{\beta_0}$, a_0 by the present value of the expansion scaling factor and b_0 is an integration constant representing the current warp of the universe. Also, the exponential function has the exponent given by $\gamma(t) = \sqrt{4\eta_0 a^4 - 3} - \sqrt{3}\arctan\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}\sqrt{4\eta_0 a^4 - 3}\right)$. The two signs represent two possible signatures of the evolution of the function $b(t)$ which can be important to study how it evolves, and in the next section, we study how it can be related to the CC problem.

III. THE BALANCE THROUGH EXTRINSIC CURVATURE

Analyzing eq.(5), a four-d observer realizes that the quantum vacuum energy density $< \rho_v >$ can be related to $\Lambda g_{\mu\nu} - Q_{\mu\nu}$ different from the case of general relativity that we only have the term $\Lambda g_{\mu\nu}$. Thus, taking eq.(5), we have

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}R g_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} - Q_{\mu\nu} = -8\pi G T_{\mu\nu} \ \ ,$$

and considering the vacuum contribution $T_{\mu\nu} = - < \rho_v > g_{\mu\nu}$, one can write

$$8\pi G < \rho_v > g_{\mu\nu} = \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} - Q_{\mu\nu} \ \ , \tag{18}$$

and contracting with $g_{\mu\nu}$, we obtain

$$< \rho_v > -\rho_\Lambda = -\frac{Q}{32\pi G} \tag{19}$$

where $Q = \ g^{\mu\nu}Q_{\mu\nu}$ is the trace of $Q_{\mu\nu}$. In addition, using eq.(12) we can write

$$< \rho_v > -\rho_\Lambda = -\frac{6b^2 B}{32\pi G a^4 H} \ , \tag{20}$$

which indicates that the discrepancy ceases to be if the extrinsic curvature can compensate such difference.

We can make now an analysis of eq.(20) starting from the "warping" function $b(t)$. Thus, we seek a general relation that can relate the expansion parameter $a(t)$ with the difference between $< \rho >_v$ and ρ_Λ. Thus, taking the Gupta solutions in eq.(17) for FLRW cosmology [1] and eq.(13), we can write the modified Friedman equation in terms of the redshift z and cosmological parameters as

$$H^2 = H_0^2 \left[\Omega_m + \Omega_{ext}\ e^{\pm\gamma(z)}\right] \ , \tag{21}$$

where Ω_m is the matter density cosmological parameter defined as $\Omega_m = \Omega_m^0(1+z)^3$ and H_0 is the current Hubble constant. Hereafter, the upper script "0" indicates the present value of certain quantity.

In order to be consistent with [1], we consider the current value for the expansion factor as $a_0 = 1$. The term $\gamma(z)$ is written in terms of the redshift z and is given by $\gamma(z) = \sqrt{\frac{4\eta_0}{(1+z)^4} - 3} - \sqrt{3}\arctan\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}\sqrt{\frac{4\eta_0}{(1+z)^4} - 3}\right)$. Inspired by the cosmic fluid analogy as well defined in standard cosmology, the extrinsic cosmological parameter can be written in terms of redshift as $\Omega_{ext} = \Omega_{ext}^0(1+z)^{4-2\beta_0}$ with $\Omega_{ext}^0 = \frac{\alpha_0^2}{H_0^2}$.

Alternatively, we can define Ω_{ext} in terms of the extrinsic energy density as

$$\Omega_{ext}^0 = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\rho_{ext}^0 \ ,$$

and also the extrinsic energy density as

$$\rho_{ext}^0 = \frac{3}{8\pi G}\frac{\alpha_0^2}{H_0^2} \ . \tag{22}$$

The parameter α_0 can be easily constrained using the normalization $H\rfloor_{z=0} = H_0$. For the present epoch, $\Omega_{total}\rfloor_{z=0} = \Omega_{ext}^0\ \exp(\gamma(0)) + \Omega_m^0 = 1$. Thus, using eq.(21), one can obtain

$$\alpha_0^2 = \frac{1 - \Omega_m^0}{\exp(\gamma(0))}H_0^2. \tag{23}$$

In addition, the estimated value for Ω_{ext}^0 can constrained with the observational values of Ω_m^0 and H_0.

Interestingly, using eqs.(17), (20) and (22), we find

$$| < \rho_v > -\rho_\Lambda | = \frac{H_0^2}{2}\rho_{ext}\ \xi(z)(1+z)^{4-2\beta_0}, \tag{24}$$

where

$$\xi(z) = \left(\beta_0 \pm \sqrt{\frac{4\eta_0}{(1+z)^4} - 3}\right)\exp\left[\pm\gamma(z)\right]. \tag{25}$$

From this equation one can obtain that the evolution of the difference of vacuum energy and CC is balanced through the extrinsic curvature evolving on redshift. Hence, in order to test the effectivity of this expression, we calculate that difference for today, i.e, $(z = 0)$. To this matter, we use the pair of parameters (β_0, η_0) that was already constrained in [37] and adopt the values $\beta_0 = 2$ and $\eta_0 = 0.25$. It is important to stress that those values constituted one of the set of solutions (models) that matched the cosmokinetics tests studied in the accelerated expansion of the universe. It was found that β_0 affects the value of current deceleration parameter q_0 and η_0 rules mainly on the width of the transition phase z_t. Based on the fact that eq.(17) can provide different solutions with the term γ, when it holds for $\pm\gamma(z) = 0$,

one can obtain the similar pattern as obtained from phenomenological solutions as shown in [1] that mimics the X-CDM model with a correspondence

$$4 - 2\beta_0 = 3(1 + w) \, , \tag{26}$$

where the parameter w holds for the exotic X-fluid parameter [38]. Rather than only reproducing known phenomenological models we are interested also in solutions $\pm\gamma \neq 0$. Thus, we adopt the current value of Hubble constant H_0 as $H_0 = 67.8 \pm 0.9 \; km.s^{-1}.Mpc^{-1}$ and the current matter density parameter $\Omega_m^0 = 0.308 \pm 0.012$ based on the latest observations [39]. Thus, using eq.(22), eq.(24) turns

$$| < \rho_v > -\rho_\Lambda | = \frac{3\alpha_0^2}{16\pi G} \rho^0{}_{ext} \xi(z = 0). \tag{27}$$

With $H_0 \sim 10^{-42} \; GeV^4$, we apply those values to eq.(27) and find that the difference $| < \rho_v > -\rho_\Lambda | \lesssim 10^{-47} GeV^4$ matches the upper bound value for the cosmological constant problem in electroweak scale. This shows that the effect of extrinsic curvature has become subtle in the present time. This interpretation seems to be very reasonable since the main process of formation of structures at cosmological scale in universe happened a long time ago and today it appears to be reduced at local scales. Since the extrinsic curvature can warp, bend or stretch a geometry, it is expected that in early times the presence of this perturbational effect played a fundamental role.

III.1. The evolving extrinsic scalar

As already pointed out, the quantity Q is an independent quantity and is defined without the need of existence of Λ. In order to get an explicit form for the evolution of this quantity, we can estimate how the extrinsic scalar Q evolves as the universe expands. Thus, using the eq.(17), we can rewrite eq.(12) as a function of the expansion factor a in terms of the Hubble constant and the current extrinsic parameter Ω_{ext}^0 as

$$Q(a) = 6H_0^2 \Omega_{ext}^0 \xi(a) a^{2\beta_0 - 4}. \tag{28}$$

One can obtain different solutions that basically depend on the signs from eq.(25) which we use to denote the absolute value of $Q(a)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
Q^{-+} &= \varpi(a) \left(\beta_0 - \sqrt{4\eta_0 a^4 - 3} \right) \exp\left[+\gamma(a) \right] \\
Q^{+-} &= \varpi(a) \left(\beta_0 + \sqrt{4\eta_0 a^4 - 3} \right) \exp\left[-\gamma(a) \right] \\
Q^{--} &= \varpi(a) \left(\beta_0 - \sqrt{4\eta_0 a^4 - 3} \right) \exp\left[-\gamma(a) \right] \\
Q^{++} &= \varpi(a) \left(\beta_0 + \sqrt{4\eta_0 a^4 - 3} \right) \exp\left[+\gamma(a) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

where we denote $\varpi(a) = 6H_0^2 \Omega_{ext}^0 a^{2\beta_0 - 4}$. Moreover, from eq.(28) one can obtain the resulting plots as shown in the left and right panels in fig.(1). In both panels, the dashed line represents the solution Q^{-+}, the thick line represents the solution Q^{+-}, the thick-dashed line represents the solution Q^{--} and the thick-dotted-dashed line represents the solution Q^{-+} and those solutions vary around $10^{-83} \sim 10^{-84} GeV^2$. As shown in the left panel in fig.(1), we obtain the evolution of the absolute value of the extrinsic scalar Q ranging from $a = 0.3$ to $a = 1$. In the right panel, we extrapolate the results and they strongly suggest that the solutions presented induce to some changing in topology of an asymptotical future universe. Interestingly, solutions Q^{++} and Q^{-+} present an increasing of the absolute value of Q. The former solution provides an earlier acceleration than the latter inducing to a more accelerated regime of the expanding universe, since we are considering the extrinsic curvature the main cause of the accelerated expansion. On the other hand, Q^{+-} and Q^{--} suggest that after the phase transition at $a \sim 1.3$ the absolute value of Q will decay and both solutions seem to converge to value less than $10^{-84} GeV^2$.

These results reinforce the idea that the extrinsic scalar Q is a dynamical quantity that evolves in time, which is expected for an expanding universe and is roughly of order of the physical CC and the Ricci scalar curvature. Such results have twofold considerations. First, the quantitative issue: the current value of Q is quantitatively similar to the physical cosmological constant and, rather, is a dynamical quantity that dominates the cosmological constant term. Second, the qualitative issues must be account carefully. The extrinsic scalar Q and CC have stinkingly different meanings. The presence of Q show us that CC must be independently from the definition of the source $T_{\mu\nu}$ [40] and the CC problem has also a topological origin. In this sense, the extrinsic curvature transfers topological characteristics from a Schwarzschild-de Sitter space-time ($\Lambda \neq 0, \kappa \neq 1$) to a Minkowski space-time ($\Lambda \approx 0, \kappa = 0$) once Riemannian manifolds also are topological spaces [41, 42].

Another qualitative aspect refers to the topological and geometrical difference between Minkowski and de Sitter space-times. Those space-times obey different symmetry groups and they are not correlated in the sense that one cannot build a de Sitter space-time starting from a continuous deformation without ripping off the manifold. The lack of a standard reference space-time is a symptom of the Riemann tensor equivalence dilemma and recognized by Riemann himself [43].

In addition, the Inönu-Wigner contraction [44] tells that we can recover Poincaré group (ISO(3,1)) from de Sitter group (SO(4,1)) with the limit $\Lambda \to 0$. However, this is valid for Lie groups due to the fact that they are analytical manifolds. Unfortunately, it does not apply to space-times since they are differentiable manifolds. In this sense, an interesting fact was pointed out in [45] that even considering an asymptotically flat spacetime ($\Lambda \to 0$) one does not obtain a Minkowskian flat space but another space-time structure governed by the Bondi-Metzner-Sachs (BMS) group that is a semi-direct product of the Lorentz group with the group of supertranslations. This observation seems to suggest serious constraints on



FIG. 1. In the left figure (a), it is shown the evolution of the absolute value of the extrinsic scalar Q ranging from $a = 0.3$ to $a = 1$, or equivalently, in redshift $z = 0$ to $z = 2.3$. The resulting curves are the solutions of different signs of Q. In the right figure (b), it is shown an extension of our results until $a = 1.5$. Both plots are in logarithm scale.

cosmological models and should be investigated in forthcoming studies.

IV. FINAL REMARKS

In a previous paper [1], we have used a model independent formulation based on the Nash embedding theorem where the extrinsic curvature is an independent variable required for the definition of the embedding. However, this comes at the price that the extrinsic curvature cannot be completely determined, because Codazzi's equations become homogeneous (incidentally, the Randall-Sundrum model avoids this problem by imposing the Israel-Lanczos condition on a fixed boundary-like braneworld). Therefore, in order to restore the definition of the extrinsic curvature an additional equation compatible with a dynamically evolving embedded space-time is required. As a rank-2 symmetric tensor, the extrinsic curvature can be seen as a spin-2 field which satisfies Einstein-like equations constituting the so-called Gupta equations for the extrinsic curvature.

The present paper complements that result where the solution of these equations describes not only on how the universe presents an accelerated expansion but also on how it is inner related to the CC problem. At the present cosmic scale, we have shown that the extrinsic curvature balances the vacuum energy and the CC energy density as a consequence of the embedding. Thus, since the CC problem takes into account the fact that the gauge fields contributing to the vacuum energy are confined to the embedded space-time, the gravitational field, including the cosmological term is not. Therefore, a four-dimensional observer in the embedded space-time is able to perceive this difference through a conserved quantity built with the extrinsic curvature whose effect induces a warp effect in the embedded geometry. Interestingly, the extrinsic quantity Q is a geometrical entity resulting from the extrinsic curvature and no prior *ansatzes* were necessary. As a consequence, implications for nucleosynthesis epoch will be a subject of future research.

[1] M.D. Maia, A.J.S Capistrano, J.S. Alcaniz, E.M. Monte, Gen. Rel. Grav., 10, 2685-2700, (2011).
[2] M.D. Maia, N. Silva , M.C.B. Fernandes, JHEP, 047, 04, (2007).
[3] S. N. Gupta, Phys. Rev. **96**, (6) (1954).
[4] S. Weinberg, Rev.Mod.Phys., 61, 1, (1989).
[5] Y.B. Zeldovich , Soviet Physics Uspekhi, 11, 381, (1968).
[6] S.M. Carroll, Living Rev.Rel., 4, 1, (2001).
[7] S. Weinberg, *The Cosmological Constant Problems (Talk given at Dark Matter 2000, February, 2000)*, ArXiv:astro-ph/0005265.
[8] W. Chen, Y.S. Wu, Phys. Rev.D41, 695, (1990).
[9] T. Padmanabhan, Gen. Rel. Grav., 40, 529-564,(2008).
[10] I. Waga, Astrophysical J., 414, 436, (1993).
[11] R. Trotta, G. Starkman, *What's the trouble with anthropic reasoning?*, ArXiv:astro-ph/0610330.
[12] Z. Kakushhadze, Phys. Lett.B, 491, 317-328, (2000).
[13] T. Padmanabhan, S. Shankaranarayanan, Phys.Rev. D, 63, 105021, (2001).
[14] S.H.H. Tye, I. Wasserman, Phys. Rev. Lett., 86, 1682, (2001).
[15] M. Cadoni, Phys. Lett. B, 642, 525529, (2006).
[16] C. Barceló, R. Carballo-Rubio, L.J. Garay, Phys. Rev.D, 89, 124019, (2014).
[17] J. Govaerts, S. Zonetti, Phys. Rev.D, 87, 084016, (2013).
[18] I. Shapiro, J. Sóla, Phys. Lett. B, 475, 236-242, (2000).

[19] I. Shapiro, J. Sóla, Nuc. Phys. B (Proc. suppl.), 127, 71-76, (2004).

[20] P.J. Steinhardt, N. Turok, Science, 312, 1180-1182, (2006).

[21] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, G. Dvali, Phys. Lett. B, 429, 263-272, (1998).

[22] L. Randall, R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett., 83, 3370, (1999).

[23] L. Randall, R. Sundrum, Phys. Rev. Lett., 83, 4690, (1999).

[24] M. Heydari-Fard, H.R. Sepangi, Phys.Lett. B, 649, 1-11, (2007).

[25] S. Jalalzadeh, M. Mehrnia, H.R. Sepangi, Class.Quant.Grav., 26, 155007, (2009).

[26] E. Anderson, R. Tavakol, Class.Quant.Grav., 20, L267, (2003).

[27] Y. Gong, C.K. Duan, Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc., 352, 847, (2004).

[28] R. Maartens, Living Rev. Rel., 7, 7, (2004).

[29] V. Sahni, Y. Shtanov, JCAP, 0311, 014, (2003).

[30] T. Shiromizu, K. Maeda, M. Sasaki, Phys. Rev. D, 62, 024012, (2000).

[31] S. Tsujikawa, M. Sami, R. Maartens, Phys. Rev. D, 70, 063525, (2004).

[32] J. Nash, Ann. Maths., 63, 20, (1956).

[33] S. Perlmutter et al., Astrophys. J., 517, 565, (1999).

[34] A.G. Riess et al., Astrophys. J., 607, 665, (2004).

[35] W. Pauli, M. Fierz, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A173, 211, (1939).

[36] C. Fronsdal, Phys. Rev. D18, 3624 (1978).

[37] A.J.S. Capistrano, Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc., 448, 1232-1239, (2015).

[38] M.S. Turner, M. White, Phys.Rev.D56, 4439-4443, (1997).

[39] P.A.R. Ade et.al. (PLANCK Collaboration), *Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters*, ArXiv: 1502.01589.

[40] M.D. Maia, Intern. Journ. Mod. Phys. A, 26, 3813-3820, (2011).

[41] O. Veblen, J.H.C. Whitehead, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci., 17, 551-561, (1931).

[42] O. Veblen, J.H.C. Whitehead, *The Foundations of Differential Geometry*, Cambridge Tracts in Math. a. Math. Phys. 29, London: Cambridge Univ. Press. IX, 97 S,(1932).

[43] B. Riemann, *On the Hypothesis That Lie at the Foundations of Geometry* (1854), translated by W. K. Clifford, Nature 8, 114, (1873).

[44] E. Inonu, E.P. Wigner, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci., 39(6), 510-524, (1953).

[45] M.D. Maia, Intern. Journ. Mod. Phys. D, 19, 2295-2298, (2010).